

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination of the claims as evidenced in the Office Action dated April 2, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections to the claims contained therein.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 14 and 15 are currently pending in this application. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

Applicant is submitting herewith corrected drawings in accordance with the PTO-948 attached to Paper No. 8, said drawings incorporating the changes approved by the Examiner on August 11, 2003.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102-103, and for indicating all pending claims contain allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the claims fail to comply with the written description requirement (see ¶ 13 of the Examiner's Office Action), and also fail to comply with the enablement requirement (see ¶ 14). The Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, asserting that the claims are indefinite (see ¶ 20). Applicant has amended claim 2 lines 4-5 to read "the *fourth* state being ordered with respect to the first and the second state." (emphasis added) Applicant has amended claim 3 to read "the *fifth* state being ordered with respect to the first state and the second state and the *fourth* state." (emphasis added) Applicant believes that such amendments correct language objected to by the Examiner, and the above rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting the claims are based upon a non-enabling disclosure (see ¶ 15 of the Office Action). The Examiner further rejected the same claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, asserting the claims are indefinite (see ¶ 18-19). Applicant has amended claim 1 lines 9-10 to read "the first state being parallel to and simultaneously active with the second state *when the*

third state is active...." (emphasis added) Applicant has amended claim 7 lines 4-6 to read "the group of states including a first state including a plurality of ordered parallel states *that are simultaneously active when the first state is active....*" (emphasis added) Applicant has amended claim 14 to read "the parallel states being ordered with respect to each other *and simultaneously active when the state is active*, the parallel states being ordered so that only *one of a plurality of substate* states of the parallel, simultaneously active states is active in response to a particular event...." (emphasis added) Applicant believes that such amendments correct language objected to by the Examiner, and the above rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

Accordingly, with entry of the amendments and consideration of the arguments and remarks contained herein, all pending claims are now allowable, and a notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if further issues remain in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nathan O. Jensen
Nathan O. Jensen
Reg. No. 41,460
Attorney for Applicant

Rockwell Collins Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-1184
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383